arXiv:0710.1430v2 [gr-qc] 5 Aug 2008

Analysis of Hamiltonian formulations of linearized General Relativity

K. R. Green*

Department of Physics and Astronomy,

University of Western Ontario, N6A 3K7, London, Canada

N. Kiriushcheva† and S. V. Kuzmin‡

Faculty of Arts and Social Science, Huron University College,

N6G 1H3 and Department of Applied Mathematics,

University of Western Ontario, N6A 5B7, London, Canada

(Dated: August 5, 2008)

Abstract

The different forms of the Hamiltonian formulations of linearized General Relativity/spin-two theories are discussed in order to show their similarities and differences. It is demonstrated that in the linear model, non-covariant modifications to the initial covariant Lagrangian (similar to those modifications used in full gravity) are in fact unnecessary. The Hamiltonians and the constraints are different in these two formulations but the structure of the constraint algebra and the gauge invariance derived from it are the same. It is shown that these equivalent Hamiltonian formulations are related to each other by a canonical transformation which is explicitly given. The relevance of these results to the full theory of General Relativity is briefly discussed.

---

*Electronic address: kgreen27@uwo.ca

†Electronic address: nkiriush@uwo.ca

‡Electronic address: skuzmin@uwo.ca

I. INTRODUCTION

Linearized Gravity is discussed in all books on General Relativity (GR) and its Hamiltonian analysis is the subject of many articles, for example [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. However, we return to this subject for three reasons. First of all, there are different Hamiltonian formulations of linearized GR but the relation among them has not been analyzed. As well, there also exist some points which are not discussed in the literature that should raise questions from outsiders to the field. Clarifying these points is our first, mainly pedagogical, goal. The second reason for our analysis is to understand the role that the linear approximation plays as a guide for the analysis of the full theory of GR. Finally, the third reason is to examine closely the custom in the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR of using some simplifications and *a priori* assumptions and to construct expected results instead of performing direct calculations without *ad hoc* modifications of the model. Investigating the linear approximation can provide insight on the assumptions and/or constructions used in the full theory of GR.

The Hamiltonian formulation of linearized GR can be approached from two quite different directions. One originates from the well-known relation of linearized GR to spin-2 theory. For the purpose of this article we use term "spin-2" as a short name for the gauge theory of the massless non-interacting symmetric second rank tensor field. Another direction is to start from the Einstein-Hilbert (EH) action and linearize it. Both approaches produce the same result if one chooses certain values of parameters appearing in the most general spin-2 Lagrangian. In addition to these approaches, we also consider the modified Lagrangian which is the linearized version of [10]. Actually, this Lagrangian is more popular in the literature, however the need for such a modification as well as a comparison with results obtained before any modification have not been analyzed.

II. LAGRANGIAN DENSITIES

A. Spin-2

We start from the action of a spin-2 field $h_{\alpha\beta} = h_{\beta\alpha}$ that can be built out of scalars which are quadratic in the derivatives $h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma}$. A very good explanation of how to build this action can be found in Appendix A of [3]. The analysis shows that out of all possible combinations, there are only five distinct terms which are quadratic in derivatives. This can be presented in the following form:

$$L = \frac{1}{4} h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} \left[c_1 \eta^{\alpha\beta}\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\gamma\rho} + c_2 \eta^{\alpha\mu}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\gamma\rho} + c_3 \eta^{\alpha\gamma}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\mu\rho} + c_4 \eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\gamma\mu} + c_5 \eta^{\alpha\beta}\eta^{\gamma\mu}\eta^{\nu\rho} \right] \tag{1}$$

where $\eta^{\alpha\beta} = diag(- + + + ...)$ is the Minkowski tensor.

The requirement that the field equations of (1) should be invariant under the following gauge transformation

$$h_{\alpha\beta} \to h_{\alpha\beta} + \xi_{\alpha,\beta} + \xi_{\beta,\alpha} \tag{2}$$

puts severe restrictions on the parameters c_i,

$$c_1 = -c_2 = 1, \;\; c_3 + c_4 = -c_5 = 2. \tag{3}$$

Consequently, except for an overall scaling factor of $\frac{1}{4}$, we have a one parameter family of Lagrangians. Note that the difference between the two terms in (1) proportional to c_3 and c_4 is a total divergence, e.g.

$$h_{\alpha\beta,\rho} h_{\mu\nu,\gamma} = h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} + \partial_\rho \left(h_{\alpha\beta} h_{\mu\nu,\gamma} \right) - \partial_\gamma \left(h_{\alpha\beta} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} \right). \tag{4}$$

B. Linear approximation of GR

We can start from the Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian

$$L_{EH} = \sqrt{-g} R. \tag{5}$$

Alternatively, by dropping a total divergence in the expression (5), and only considering the "gamma-gamma" part of L_{EH}, one obtains [11, 12]

$$L_{\Gamma\Gamma} = \sqrt{-g} g^{\alpha\beta} \left(\Gamma^{\mu}_{\alpha\nu} \Gamma^{\nu}_{\beta\mu} - \Gamma^{\nu}_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma^{\mu}_{\nu\mu} \right) = \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{-g} B^{\alpha\beta\gamma\mu\nu\rho} g_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} g_{\mu\nu,\rho} \tag{6}$$

where

$$B^{\alpha\beta\gamma\mu\nu\rho} = g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\gamma\rho} g^{\mu\nu} - g^{\alpha\mu} g^{\beta\nu} g^{\gamma\rho} + 2 g^{\alpha\rho} g^{\beta\nu} g^{\gamma\mu} - 2 g^{\alpha\beta} g^{\gamma\mu} g^{\nu\rho}. \tag{7}$$

To find the linear approximation of the EH Lagrangian, we take $g^{\alpha\beta} = \eta^{\alpha\beta} - h^{\alpha\beta}$ and substitute this into (5), keeping only terms quadratic in the derivatives of $h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma}$ and disregard a total divergence. We thus obtain

$$L_{lin} = \frac{1}{4} h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} \left(\eta^{\alpha\beta}\eta^{\gamma\rho}\eta^{\mu\nu} - \eta^{\alpha\mu}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\gamma\rho} + 2\eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\gamma\mu} - 2\eta^{\alpha\beta}\eta^{\gamma\mu}\eta^{\nu\rho} \right) . \tag{8}$$

The most straightforward approach to the linearization of GR is to use $L_{\Gamma\Gamma}$ (6), applying the simple rules

$$g^{\alpha\beta} \to \eta^{\alpha\beta}, \quad \sqrt{-g} \to 1, \quad g_{\alpha\beta} \to h_{\alpha\beta} \tag{9}$$

which immediately gives the Lagrangian of (1) with parameters satisfying (3) and $c_3 = 0$. These terms directly follow from the EH action and after linearization we can do an integration by parts with two terms, in this order only. We note that by (4) the terms $c_3 h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} \eta^{\alpha\gamma}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\mu\rho}$ and $c_4 h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} h_{\mu\nu,\rho} \eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\mu\gamma}$ are equivalent up to a surface term but this cannot be generalized to the corresponding terms in full GR, e.g. for $c_3\sqrt{-g} g_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} g_{\mu\nu,\rho} g^{\alpha\gamma} g^{\beta\nu} g^{\mu\rho}$ and $c_4\sqrt{-g} g_{\alpha\beta,\gamma} g_{\mu\nu,\rho} g^{\alpha\rho} g^{\beta\nu} g^{\mu\gamma}$.

C. Modifications

In the literature on the Hamiltonian formulation of linearized GR, one can find a few different initial Lagrangians with $c_3 = 0$ (e.g. [7]) or $c_4 = 0$ (e.g. [4]). It is perfectly correct to consider both cases for spin-2/linear approximation of GR but it is not clear why it is necessary to perform an additional integration by parts to set $c_4 = 0$ if direct linearization gives $c_3 = 0$. What is not at all clear is the reason for requiring further modification of the covariant Lagrangian and to present it in non-covariant form "up to total space and time derivatives" [1] or "after some rearrangements" [7, 8]. Of course, it is not difficult to restore these integrations once we know the final result.

However, there is no justification for converting a covariant action into non-covariant form before starting the Hamiltonian procedure. In particular, it is not at all apparent why one would do this in the Hamiltonian formulation of linearized GR/spin-2. Here we can only guess answers to the above questions. This non-covariant modification of the action is likely related to Dirac's work on the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR [10] which came before the weak approximation. Dirac explained that the reason for this modification is to simplify the primary constraints. However, he warned that this simplification "force one to abandon the four-dimensional symmetry". This change in the Lagrangian occurs in equation (15) of [10]:

$$L_{\Gamma\Gamma} \rightarrow L^*_{\Gamma\Gamma} = L_{\Gamma\Gamma} - \left[\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{00} \right)_{,k} \frac{g^{k0}}{g^{00}} \right]_{,0} + \left[\left(\sqrt{-g} g^{00} \right)_{,0} \frac{g^{k0}}{g^{00}} \right]_{,k} . \tag{10}$$

Note that here and everywhere we have chosen the opposite sign to Dirac because we use the definition of L in [11, 12].

The last two non-covariant terms in (10) do not affect the equations of motion and simplify the primary constraints (see next Section) because they eliminate terms linear in the velocities $g_{0\mu,0}$. In the linearized case (which can be obtained by linearization of (10) or by linearization of the general result of Dirac's (see equation (17) of [10]) these two terms become

$$L^*_{\Gamma\Gamma} - L_{\Gamma\Gamma} = \frac{1}{2} \eta^{00} \left[h_{00,0} h_{m0,k} \eta^{mk} \eta^{00} - h_{pq,0} h_{m0,k} \eta^{pq} \eta^{mk} - h_{m0,0} h_{00,k} \eta^{mk} \eta^{00} + h_{m0,0} h_{pq,k} \eta^{pq} \eta^{mk} \right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left[h_{00,0} h^k_{0,k} + h^p_{p,0} h^k_{0,k} - h^k_{0,0} h_{00,k} - h^k_{0,0} h^p_{p,k} \right] . \tag{11}$$

Equation (11) in combination with $L_{\Gamma\Gamma}$, leads to a cancellation of some terms that are linear in the velocities, and results in Dirac's Lagrangian as used in [1, 7, 8]

$$\begin{aligned} L_{Dirac(lin)} = {} & \frac{1}{4} h^{pq}{}_{,0} h_{pq,0} - \frac{1}{4} h^p_{p,0} h^q_{q,0} + h^p_{p,0} h^k_{0,k} - h^{pk}{}_{,0} h_{0p,k} + \frac{1}{2} h_{00,k} \left(h^{kp}{}_{,p} - \eta^{kp} h^q_{q,p} \right) + \\ & \frac{1}{2} h^p_{0,k} h_{0p}{}^{,k} - \frac{1}{2} h^p_{0,k} h^k_{0,p} + \frac{1}{4} h^p_{p,k} h^{q,k}_q - \frac{1}{4} h^{pq}{}_{,k} h_{pq}{}^{,k} + \frac{1}{2} h^{pq}{}_{,k} h^k_{p,q} - \frac{1}{2} h^{pk}{}_{,k} h^q_{q,p} . \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Later we will demonstrate explicitly that it is *not* necessary to make this non-covariant modification in the Hamiltonian formulation of linearized Gravity. Then the relevant discussion about the necessity of this modification for full GR will be presented in the Discussion Section.

III. HAMILTONIAN

A. Non-covariant case

The method used here was developed by Dirac [13] and below we briefly summarize the main steps of his method. Introducing the momenta conjugate to $h_{\mu\nu}$:

$$p^{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta L_{Dirac(lin)}}{\delta h_{\mu\nu,0}} \tag{13}$$

gives the primary constraints

$$\phi^{0\mu} = p^{0\mu} \approx 0, \tag{14}$$

and an equation for p^{kn}

$$p^{kn} = \frac{1}{2}\eta^{kn} h^{p,0}_{p} - \frac{1}{2}h^{kn,0} + \frac{1}{2}h^{k0,n} + \frac{1}{2}h^{n0,k} - \eta^{kn} h^{p0}_{\ \ ,p}\ . \tag{15}$$

Solving (15) for the velocities gives

$$h_{kn,0} = 2p_{kn} - \frac{2}{d-2}\eta_{kn} p^{m}_{m} + h_{0k,n} + h_{0n,k}. \tag{16}$$

The factor of $(d-2)$ appearing in the denominator reflects the fact that (15) cannot be solved for a velocity in two dimensions. The treatment of $2D$ linearized gravity appears in the following Subsection.

Substituting velocities from (16) into the Lagrangian (12), we obtain the canonical Hamiltonian

$$H_{c(Dirac)} = p^{kn}\dot{h}_{kn} - L_{lin} = p^{k}_{n} p^{n}_{k} - \frac{1}{d-2} p^{k}_{k} p^{n}_{n} + 2p^{nk} h_{k0,n} - \frac{1}{2} h_{00,k}\left(h^{kp}_{\ \ ,p} - \eta^{kp} h^{q}_{q,p}\right)$$

$$- \frac{1}{4} h^{p}_{p,k} h^{q,k}_{q} + \frac{1}{4} h^{pq}_{\ \ ,k} h_{pq}^{\ \ ,k} - \frac{1}{2} h^{pq}_{\ \ ,k}\, h^{k}_{p,q} + \frac{1}{2} h^{pk}_{\ \ ,k} h^{q}_{q,p} \tag{17}$$

and the total Hamiltonian

$$H_{T(Dirac)} = H_{c(Dirac)} + \dot{h}_{0\mu}\phi^{0\mu}. \tag{18}$$

Direct calculation of the Hamiltonian (17) results in two additional terms, $h_0^{p,k} h_0^{k,p}$ and $-h^p_{0,p} h^k_{0,k}$, but since these two terms can be expressed as a total derivative, we do not include them in the Hamiltonian.

With the fundamental Poisson brackets (PB) defined as

$$\{h_{\alpha\beta}, p^{\mu\nu}\} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\delta^\mu_\alpha \delta^\nu_\beta + \delta^\nu_\alpha \delta^\mu_\beta\right) \equiv \Delta^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta}$$

the conservation of primary (14) constraints results in the secondary constraints

$$\dot{\phi}^{00} = \left\{\phi^{00}, H_T\right\} = \frac{1}{2}\left(h^{k,n}_{n,k} - h^{k,n}_{k,n}\right) \equiv \chi^{00}, \tag{19}$$

$$\dot{\phi}^{0n} = \left\{\phi^{0n}, H_T\right\} = p^{nk}_{\ \ ,k} \ \equiv \chi^{0n}. \tag{20}$$

All constraints have vanishing PB among themselves, so all of them are first class (FC) at this stage of the Dirac procedure. To verify the closure of the Dirac procedure we have to consider the time development of the secondary constraints to check whether they produce any new constraints. We find

$$\dot{\chi}^{00} = \left\{\chi^{00}, H_T\right\} = \chi^{0k}_{,k}, \quad \dot{\chi}^{0n} = \left\{\chi^{0n}, H_T\right\} = 0, \tag{21}$$

so, no new constraints appear and the Dirac procedure closes with $2d$ FC constraints ($d > 2$). Counting the degrees of freedom gives, for example, in the $d = 4$ case: 10 (*variables* $h_{\mu\nu}$) $-$ 8 (*FC constraints*) $= 2$, as is expected for the massless spin-2 system.

Now, from our knowledge of the FC constraints, we can find the gauge transformations by using the procedure of Castellani [14]. The gauge generators are of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} G_{(0)} &= -\chi^{00} + \int \left(\alpha\phi^{00} + \alpha_n \phi^{0n}\right) d^{d-1}x, \\ G^n_{(0)} &= -\chi^{0n} + \int \left(\beta^n \phi^{00} + \beta\phi^{0n}\right) d^{d-1}x. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The coefficients α and β can be found from the conditions [14]:

$$\dot{G}_{(0)} = \left\{G_{(0)}, H\right\} = -\chi^{0n}_{\ \ ,n} + \alpha\chi^{00} + \alpha_n \chi^{0n} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha = 0, \quad \alpha_n = \partial_n,$$

$$\dot{G}^n_{(0)} = \left\{G^n_{(0)}, H\right\} = 0 + \beta^n \chi^{00} + \beta\chi^{0n} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \beta^n = \beta = 0. \tag{23}$$

The total gauge generator is

$$G\left(\varepsilon_\mu, \dot{\varepsilon}_\mu\right) = \int d^{d-1}x \left(\varepsilon_0 G_{(0)} - \dot{\varepsilon}_0 \phi^{00} + \varepsilon_n G^n_{(0)} - \dot{\varepsilon}_n \phi^{0n}\right) = \\ \int d^{d-1}x \left(\varepsilon_0 \chi^{00} - \varepsilon_{0,n} \phi^{0n} - \dot{\varepsilon}_0 \phi^{00} + \varepsilon_n \chi^{0n} - \dot{\varepsilon}_n \phi^{0n}\right), \tag{24}$$

where ε_μ is the gauge parameter. It is easy to show that the PB of two generators is zero since PBs among all FC constraints are zero. Now we can find the gauge transformations of the canonical variables $h_{\mu\nu}$ and $p^{\mu\nu}$:

$$\delta h_{\mu\nu} = \left\{G\left(\varepsilon_\gamma, \dot{\varepsilon}_\gamma\right), h_{\mu\nu}\right\} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\varepsilon_{\mu,\nu} + \varepsilon_{\nu,\mu}\right), \tag{25}$$

$$\delta p^{00} = \delta p^{0k} = 0, \quad \delta p^{kn} = \frac{1}{2}\left({\varepsilon_0}^{,kn} - \eta^{kn} \varepsilon_{0,p}^{,p}\right) \tag{26}$$

which give $\delta\chi^{0n} = \delta p^{kn}_{,k} = 0$ and $\delta\chi^{00} = 0$. It is straightforward to verify that these gauge transformations keep the Lagrangian invariant up to a total derivative. Note that the final expression (25) has four-dimensional symmetry and Dirac's statement about "abandoning four-dimensional symmetry" is restricted to only his modification of the Lagrangian which initially possesses this four-dimensional symmetry.

In $2D$, Dirac's modified Lagrangian $L_{Dirac(lin)}$ vanishes, so we can say that the theory is meaningless in $2D$ or, using the words of Jackiw, "it cannot even be formulated" [15]. However, from the fact that the modified Lagrangian is zero, it does not follow that the EH Lagrangian is meaningless in $2D$. It follows that the non-covariant modification of (10) should not be performed because it eliminates the essential contributions of the original Lagrangian. In contrast, if we do not modify the Lagrangian, then the Hamiltonian analysis gives consistent results in both the linearized (see next Subsection) and the non-linearized $2D$ cases [16, 17].

B. Covariant case

We redo the Hamiltonian formulation for the massless spin-2 field, but now use the covariant form (1) subject to (3). To be able to compare with the results of others, and to see what effects (if any) the presence of a free parameter following from the relation $c_3 + c_4 = 2$ has, we perform our calculations using the most general covariant Lagrangian:

$$L=\frac{1}{4}h_{\alpha\beta,\gamma}h_{\mu\nu,\rho}\left[\eta^{\alpha\beta}\eta^{\mu\nu}\eta^{\gamma\rho}-\eta^{\alpha\mu}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\gamma\rho}+c_3\eta^{\alpha\gamma}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\mu\rho}+c_4\eta^{\alpha\rho}\eta^{\beta\nu}\eta^{\gamma\mu}-2\eta^{\alpha\beta}\eta^{\gamma\mu}\eta^{\nu\rho}\right]. \quad (27)$$

Introducing momenta conjugate to $h_{\mu\nu}$:

$$\pi^{\mu\nu}=\frac{\delta L}{\delta h_{\mu\nu,0}} \quad (28)$$

results in the primary constraints

$$\phi^{00}=\pi^{00}-\frac{1}{2}\left(1-c_3\right)h^{0k}_{\ ,k}, \quad (29)$$

$$\phi^{0n}=\pi^{0n}+\frac{c_3}{4}h^{nk}_{\ ,k}-\frac{1}{4}h^{k,n}_{k}+\frac{c_3-1}{4}h^{00,n}. \quad (30)$$

Note, that in the covariant case the maximum simplification of the primary constraints follows from $c_3=1$, so that one constraint becomes $\pi^{00}\approx 0$. However, we cannot do this in the full GR Lagrangian without destroying the symmetry of d-dimensional spacetime.

From $\pi^{kn}=\frac{\delta L}{\delta h_{kn,0}}$ one obtains

$$\pi^{kn}=\frac{1}{4}\left(2\eta^{kn}h^{p,0}_{p}-2h^{kn,0}+c_4\left(h^{k0,n}+h^{n0,k}\right)-2\eta^{kn}h^{p0}_{\ ,p}\right). \quad (31)$$

Solving (31) for the velocities produces the following equation

$$h_{kn,0}=2\pi_{kn}-\frac{2}{d-2}\eta_{kn}\pi^{p}_{p}+\frac{1}{d-2}\left(1-c_4\right)\eta_{kn}h^{p}_{0,p}+\frac{c_4}{2}\left(h_{0k,n}+h_{0n,k}\right). \quad (32)$$

Once again, the factor $(d-2)$ appears in the denominator of some of the terms in the right-hand side of (32).

Substituting the velocities from (32) into the Lagrangian (27) one obtains the canonical Hamiltonian

$$H_c=\pi^{kn}\dot{h}_{kn}-L=\pi^{k}_{n}\pi^{n}_{k}-\frac{1}{d-2}\pi^{k}_{k}\pi^{n}_{n}-c_4\pi^{n}_{k}h^{0k}_{\ ,n}-\frac{1-c_4}{d-2}\pi^{k}_{k}h^{0n}_{\ ,n}+$$

$$\left[\frac{1-c_4}{4}-\frac{\left(1-c_4\right)^2}{4\left(d-2\right)}\right]h^{0k}_{\ ,k}h^{0n}_{\ ,n}+\left(\frac{\left(c_4\right)^2}{8}+\frac{c_4}{4}\right)h^{0k}_{\ ,n}h^{0n}_{\ ,k}+\left(\frac{\left(c_4\right)^2}{8}-\frac{1}{2}\right)h^{0k}_{\ ,n}h^{0,n}_{k}+ \quad (33)$$

$$\frac{1}{2}h_{00}^{\ ,n}\left(h^k_{k,n}-h^k_{n,k}\right)-\frac{1}{4}h^n_{n,k}h^{p,k}_p+\frac{1}{4}h^n_{p,k}h^{p,k}_n-\frac{c_3}{4}h_{pn}^{\ \ ,n}h^{kp}_{\ \ ,k}-\frac{c_4}{4}h^{p,k}_n h_{pk}^{\ \ ,n}+\frac{1}{2}h^p_{p,k}h^{nk}_{\ \ ,n}$$

and the total Hamiltonian

$$H_T = H_c + \dot{h}_{0\mu}\phi^{0\mu}. \tag{34}$$

Setting $c_3 = 0$ and $c_4 = 2$ in (33) leaves us with a couple more terms than in the non-covariant case of (17), more specifically:

$$H_{c(covariant,\ c_3=0)} - H_{c(Dirac)} = \frac{1}{d-2}\pi^k_k h^{0n}_{\ \ ,n} - \frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{d-2}-3\right)h^{0k}_{\ \ ,k}h^{0n}_{\ \ ,n}$$

where a total derivative has again been omitted.

With the fundamental PB defined as

$$\left\{h_{\alpha\beta},\pi^{\mu\nu}\right\} = \Delta^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta}$$

the conservation of primary constraints in time gives the secondary constraints

$$\dot{\phi}^{00} = \left\{\phi^{00}, H_T\right\} = \frac{1}{2}\left(h^{k,n}_{k,n} - h^{k,n}_{n,k}\right) \equiv \chi^{00}, \tag{35}$$

$$\dot{\phi}^{0n} = \left\{\phi^{0n}, H_T\right\} = \pi^{nk}_{\ \ ,k} + \frac{c_4}{4}h^{k,n}_{0,k} - \frac{c_3}{4}h^{n,k}_{0,k} \equiv \chi^{0n}. \tag{36}$$

Note that in the covariant case, even for linearized gravity, χ^{0n} depends on the spatial derivatives of h_{0k}.

All constraints have zero PBs among themselves, so all of them are first class (FC) at this stage of the Dirac procedure. It is easy to verify that no new constraints appear:

$$\dot{\chi}^{00} = \left\{\chi^{00}, H_T\right\} = \chi^{0k}_{\ \ ,k}, \quad \dot{\chi}^{0n} = \left\{\chi^{0n}, H_T\right\} = 0. \tag{37}$$

This gives the same constraint structure and the number of degrees of freedom as in the non-covariant case (21) despite the difference in the expressions of the primary and secondary constraints.

From the FC constraints, we can once again find the gauge transformations using the Castellani procedure, described in the previous Subsection.

The total gauge generator can be calculated as in (24), except that the constraints are now given by (29), (30), (35), and (36). Nevertheless, it produces the same gauge transformations for $h_{\mu\nu}$

$$\delta h_{\mu\nu} = \{G(\varepsilon_\gamma, \dot{\varepsilon}_\gamma), h_{\mu\nu}\} = \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_{\mu,\nu} + \varepsilon_{\nu,\mu})$$

while for $\pi^{\mu\nu}$ it gives

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\pi^{00} &= \frac{c_3 - c_4}{8}\left(\varepsilon_{0,n}^{\ \ ,n} + \varepsilon_{n,0}^{\ \ ,n}\right), \quad \delta\pi^{0k} = \frac{c_3 - c_4}{8}\varepsilon_0^{\ ,0k} + \frac{c_4}{8}\varepsilon^{n,k}_{\ \ ,n} - \frac{c_3}{8}\varepsilon^{k,n}_{\ \ ,n}, \\ \delta\pi^{kn} &= \frac{1}{4}\eta^{kn}\varepsilon_{0,p}^{\ \ ,p} - \frac{1}{4}\eta^{kn}\varepsilon_{p,0}^{\ \ ,p} - \frac{c_4}{4}\varepsilon_0^{\ ,kn} + \frac{c_3}{8}\left(\varepsilon^{k,n}_{\ \ ,0} + \varepsilon^{n,k}_{\ \ ,0}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

It is straightforward to verify that these gauge transformations as in the non-covariant case leave all constraints unchanged and the Lagrangian invariant up to a total derivative:

$$\delta L = \frac{1}{4}\left[\partial_\alpha\left(\left(c_3\varepsilon^{\gamma,\alpha} - c_4\varepsilon^{\alpha,\gamma}\right)h_{\mu\gamma}^{\ \ ,\mu}\right) - \partial^\mu\left(\left(c_3\varepsilon^{\gamma,\alpha} - c_4\varepsilon^{\alpha,\gamma}\right)h_{\gamma\mu,\alpha}\right)\right].$$

When $d = 2$, the original Lagrangian of (27) is drastically simplified (note, if $c_4 = 2$, this Lagrangian can be obtained from the $2D$ Lagrangian given in [16] by applying the substitution of (9) to $L_{\Gamma\Gamma}$):

$$L_{2d} = \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}\left(h_{11,1}h_{01,0} - h_{01,1}h_{11,0} + h_{00,1}h_{01,0} - h_{01,1}h_{00,0}\right). \tag{39}$$

This expression is linear in the velocities, so no velocity can be eliminated using equations of motion. The momenta conjugate to h_{00}, h_{11}, and h_{01} give three primary constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^{00} &= \pi^{00} + \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}h_{01,1}, \quad \phi^{11} = \pi^{11} + \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}h_{01,1}, \\ \phi^{01} &= \pi^{01} - \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}\left(h_{11,1} + h_{00,1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

The PBs among these constraints are all zero, and their time development does not produce any new constraints. Therefore the Dirac procedure closes with three FC primary constraints, so that there are zero degrees of freedom in $2D$. The canonical Hamiltonian is zero and the total Hamiltonian is then just a linear combination of primary constraints:

$$H_T = \dot{h}_{\mu\nu}\phi^{\mu\nu}. \tag{41}$$

The gauge generator is simplified as well

$$G = \int dx \left(\varepsilon_{00} \phi^{00} + 2\varepsilon_{01} \phi^{01} + \varepsilon_{11} \phi^{11} \right) \tag{42}$$

which results in the following gauge transformations of the canonical variables

$$\delta h_{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}, \tag{43}$$

$$\delta \pi^{00} = \delta \pi^{11} = -\frac{c_4 - c_3}{2} \varepsilon_{01,1}, \quad \delta \pi^{01} = \frac{c_4 - c_3}{4} \left(\varepsilon_{00,1} + \varepsilon_{11,1} \right). \tag{44}$$

One should note that the gauge transformations of $h_{\mu\nu}$ are exactly the same as were obtained for the full (not linearized) "gamma-gamma" part of the EH Lagrangian in [16] and for the full EH Lagrangian using the Ostrogradsky procedure in [17]. These gauge transformations are consistent with the triviality of the Einstein equations in $2D$. (In [16] it is pointed out that in gauge in which $g_{01} \neq 0$, the EH action in $2D$ is not merely a surface term).

The gauge transformations of $h_{\mu\nu}$ of (43) leave the Lagrangian invariant up to a total derivative, which can be cast in a covariant form

$$\delta L_{2d} = \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon^{\gamma\rho} \eta^{\mu\nu} \partial_\beta \left(h_{\gamma\mu} \varepsilon_{\rho\nu,\alpha} \right)$$

where $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta} = -\epsilon^{\beta\alpha}$.

It is easy to check that $\delta\phi^{\mu\nu} = 0$ and $\delta H_T = 0$ under these gauge transformations.

We note that if $c_3 = c_4 = 1$, then the Lagrangian (39) is zero, and therefore in this case there is no Hamiltonian formulation. These values of c_3 and c_4 are only possible in linearized GR. The full GR in covariant form requires $c_3 = 0$ and $c_4 = 2$ as was mentioned above.

IV. EQUIVALENCE

The equivalence of different formulations of linearized GR/spin-2 considered in previous Sections can be discussed for Lagrangians and the corresponding Hamiltonians. At Lagrangian level this equivalence is quite obvious because the parameters of covariant spin-2 Lagrangian (1) were found from the condition of invariance given in (2) and two terms proportional to c_3 and c_4 are equivalent up to total divergences of (4) and do not affect the equations of motion. Dirac's non-covariant modification in (10) differs from (8) by non-covariant integrations, however, the Dirac Lagrangian also leads to the same equations of motion. We thus can conclude that both Lagrangians are equivalent.

The demonstration of equivalence for the Hamiltonian formulations in the covariant and modified by Dirac cases is a little bit more involved and worth discussing in some detail. We have found, that despite having different primary and secondary constraints and different expressions for the canonical Hamiltonians, the PBs among the constraints and constraints with the Hamiltonian have the same structure for both formulations (see (21), (37)). The Castellani procedure leads to the same gauge transformations for both formulations.

From ordinary classical mechanics [18] it is known that performing canonical transformations from one set of variables to another leads to equivalent Hamiltonian formulations. Let us try to find such transformations between the covariant (h, π) variables and the (h, p) of Dirac's formulation. The change of the momenta $p^{0\mu}$ is quite obvious

$$p^{00} = \pi^{00} - \frac{1 - c_3}{2} h^{0k}{}_{,k}, \tag{45}$$

$$p^{0n} = \pi^{0n} + \frac{c_3}{4} h^{nk}{}_{,k} - \frac{1}{4} h_k^{k,n} + \frac{c_3 - 1}{4} h^{00,n}. \tag{46}$$

For the space-space components of the momenta one can try to obtain such relations by comparing expressions for the corresponding velocities ((16) and (32)) in the two formulations which gives

$$p^{nk} = \pi^{nk} + \frac{c_3}{4} \left(h^{k0,n} + h^{0n,k} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \eta^{kn} h^{p0}{}_{,p}. \tag{47}$$

Generalized coordinates are treated in the same way in both formulations, so we have the following transformations

$$p^{\alpha\beta} = p^{\alpha\beta} \left(\pi^{\mu\nu}, h_{\mu\nu} \right), \quad h_{\alpha\beta} = h_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{48}$$

To check whether this change in variables is canonical, one has to calculate the following PB [18]

$$\left\{ h_{\mu\nu}, p^{\alpha\beta} \right\}_{p,h} = \left\{ h_{\mu\nu}, p^{\alpha\beta} \left(\pi^{\mu\nu}, h_{\mu\nu} \right) \right\}_{\pi,h} = \Delta^{\alpha\beta}_{\mu\nu} \tag{49}$$

and

$$\left\{p^{\alpha\beta}, p^{\mu\nu}\right\}_{p,h} = \left\{p^{\alpha\beta}, p^{\mu\nu}\right\}_{\pi,h} = 0, \tag{50}$$

$$\left\{h_{\alpha\beta}, h_{\mu\nu}\right\}_{p,h} = \left\{h_{\alpha\beta}, h_{\mu\nu}\right\}_{\pi,h} = 0. \tag{51}$$

Equation (51) is obviously satisfied by (48), and equations (49) and (50) can be shown to be satisfied after a short calculation. For Hamiltonian formulations of non-singular Lagrangians demonstrating (49)-(51) would be enough to prove that the two Hamiltonians are equivalent. For singular models, this is only a necessary condition. To show equivalence for the case of two Hamiltonian formulations of a gauge invariant Lagrangian, we must also demonstrate that the whole algebra of constraints is preserved because the whole algebra is needed to find the generator of gauge transformations. Let us check this requirement and substitute the inverse of (48), $\pi^{\alpha\beta} = \pi^{\alpha\beta}\left(p^{\mu\nu}, h_{\mu\nu}\right)$, into the total Hamiltonian in the covariant formulation of (34)

$$H_T\left(\pi^{\alpha\beta}, h_{\alpha\beta}; c_3, c_4\right) = \dot{h}_{0\mu}\phi^{0\mu} + H_c\left(\pi^{km}, h_{\alpha\beta}; c_3, c_4\right) =$$

$$\dot{h}_{0\mu}p^{0\mu} + p^k_n p^n_k - \frac{1}{d-2}p^k_k p^n_n + 2p^{nk}h_{k0,n} - \frac{1}{2}h_{00,k}\left(h^{kp}_{\ \ ,p} - \eta^{kp}h^q_{q,p}\right)$$

$$-\frac{1}{4}h^p_{p,k}h^{q,k}_q + \frac{1}{4}h^{pq}{}_{,k}h_{pq}{}^{,k} - \frac{c_3}{4}h_{pq}{}^{,q}h^{kp}{}_{,k} - \frac{c_4}{4}h^{pq}{}_{,k}\ h^k_{p,q} + \frac{1}{2}h^{pk}{}_{,k}h^q_{q,p}. \tag{52}$$

With $c_3 = 0$ ($c_4 = 2$) we recover the Hamiltonian of Dirac (18) that was obtained by non-covariant modification of the Lagrangian of linearized GR. In fact, according to (52), similar modifications in the linearized GR/spin-2 case can be made for all possible values of parameters satisfying $c_3 + c_4 = 2$. Hence, the Hamiltonian formulations that generate the same gauge transformations are related by canonical transformations that also must preserve the whole algebra of constraints, although the expressions of constraints themselves might change.

We will now briefly comment on similar relations in $2D$. In this case, we consider the following change of variables, using (40),

$$p^{00} = \pi^{00} + \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}h_{01,1}, \quad p^{11} = \pi^{11} + \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}h_{01,1}, \quad p^{01} = \pi^{01} - \frac{c_3 - c_4}{4}\left(h_{11,1} + h_{00,1}\right). \tag{53}$$

which satisfy the conditions (49)-(51). Substitution of (53) into (41) gives

$$H_T = \dot{h}_{00}p^{00} + 2\dot{h}_{01}p^{01} + \dot{h}_{11}p^{11}. \tag{54}$$

We thus see that using the Castellani procedure, one finds the same gauge transformations as in (43). So, keeping the $2D$ Lagrangian (39) as it is and performing canonical transformations at the Hamiltonian level we have another consistent Hamiltonian formulation of linearized GR in $2D$ (with simple constraints). This is different from the case of Dirac's modifications which were performed at the Lagrangian level and led to disappearance of the Lagrangian in $2D$. One may say that $2D$ GR makes no sense and that discussing its Hamiltonian formulation without modifications of the Lagrangian is meaningless [15]. However, exactly opposite is correct and without non-covariant modifications of the Lagrangian we have meaningful Hamiltonian formulation of $2D$ GR.

In the covariant case we have one value of parameters ($c_3 = c_4 = 1$) that also leads to complete disappearance of the Lagrangian, but we can pick these values of the parameters *only* in the linearized EH action. For full GR only one value is permissible, $c_4 = 2$, if one is to keep covariance.

A possible objection against our result for the Hamiltonian formulation of $2D$ GR is that it does not produce the "expected" gauge invariance, diffeomorphism. However, in $2D$ it is not possible to obtain diffeomorphism as a gauge symmetry. This conclusion can be drawn from a simple consideration: to "construct" diffeomorphism, using the Castellani procedure, we have to have d primary and d secondary FC constraints, which in $2D$ means we need four FC constraints. However, in $2D$ a metric tensor has only three independent components and the usual counting of degrees of freedom will give minus one, meaning that the system is overconstrainted, and non-physical. We think that the effect of any non-covariant modification of the EH Lagrangian should be investigated in all dimensions for full GR as well as the canonical transformations (if any) among different sets of variables used in the Hamiltonian formulations of GR.

V. DISCUSSION

We now consider the conclusions that can be drawn about the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR based on an analysis of the linearized models. Carmeli [12] says: "our experience shows that solutions of the linearized equations may bear little or no relation to solutions of the rigorous equations"; and later: "One should therefore in no way consider the linearized theory as being a substitute to the full theory". Consequently, using the Hamiltonian formulation of linearized GR as a guide has to be done cautiously. First of all, there are well-known differences between the Hamiltonian formulations of linearized and full GR. In particular, contrary to the linearized case, the Hamiltonian of full GR is proportional to secondary constraints [10], the algebra of the secondary constraints has field-dependent structure functions, and the equations of motion are invariant under diffeomorphism transformation only "on-shell". Secondly, it is impossible to compare the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR with the results presented here for another reason: the restoration of gauge invariance in the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR was considered neither in the formulation of [19] which corresponds to the covariant linearized case nor in the formulation of [10] which corresponds to the non-covariant linearized case. Third, for the ADM formulation [20] which is based on a change of variables (from the components $g_{0\mu}$ to the lapse and shifts functions) it is not clear how linearization can even be performed (in [21] the linearized version of GR was discussed using the metric tensor, not the ADM variables). In addition, the ADM formulation (the only one in which a restoration of gauge invariance from the complete set of first class constraints has even been considered), does not lead to the expected diffeomorphism invariance as it was recently demonstrated in [22] using a method [23] different from Castellani's. The result of [22] is the most complete one in the literature but it is not new and has been discussed in part previously in [14], [24]. Almost immediately after the appearance of [22], the restoration of gauge transformations in GR was considered by Samanta [25] using the Lagrangian approach of [26]. This method indeed leads to the diffeomorphism invariance.

With these observations (and Carmeli's warning) we see that it is not easy to draw conclusions about the full theory of GR. However, looking at the general results obtained in linearized GR we can still make some conjectures. The Hamiltonian formulation of gauge invariant theories allows one to restore gauge symmetry. Diffeomorphism invariance was obtained by Samanta in the Lagrangian approach. Thus, considering the covariant formulation of [19] we can expect the restoration of this symmetry as well. Secondly, the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR which is based on the Dirac modifications which we have considered in the linearized case does not affect the equations of motion and consequently has to give the same transformations as those that occur in the covariant case. In addition, as it was discussed in the previous Section, these two formulations must be connected by a canonical transformation. Of course, as in the linearized case, the explicit expressions for the constraints in terms of fields should be different but their PB algebra has to be preserved in order that the gauge transformations be the same. It is important to note that our expressions for constraints in the covariant linear case, both primary (29) and secondary (36), depend on the space-time components h_{0k}. Since the treatment of full GR has to keep the linearized limit intact, we have to have such contributions, g_{0k}, in the corresponding constraints of full GR theory and their disappearance in [10] is not a general property of the Hamiltonian formulation of GR but rather the result of the non-covariant modification of the initial Lagrangian. The explicit dependance of secondary constraints on g_{0k} for the Hamiltonian formulation of full GR [19] is demonstrated in [27].

Moreover, if equivalent Hamiltonian formulations leading to the same gauge invariance are connected by canonical transformations, then it is natural to expect the converse to be true. If we have different gauge transformations in different approaches, then the fields appearing in the Hamiltonians of these approaches are not related by a canonical transformation. A Hamiltonian that does not lead to diffeomorphism invariance is built on non-canonical variables which destroy the equivalence and such a formulation is not a canonical formulation of GR. This is what we can expect for the ADM formulation because the gauge transformations that follow from the ADM Hamiltonian are not a diffeomorphism. Without performing a change of variables the diffeomorphism invariance is derivable [27] from the constraint structure of the Hamiltonian formulation of full (non-linearized) GR [19].

The distinction between the Hamiltonian formulation of full and linearized GR and our conjectures about different formulations of full GR are under investigation. Our results will be published elsewhere.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to A. M. Frolov, D. G. C. McKeon and S. R. Valluri for helpful discussions. The research was partially supported by the Huron University College Faculty of Arts and

Social Science Research Grant Fund.

[1] Baaklini N S and Tuite M 1979 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **1** L13

[2] McKeon D G C 1979 *Can. J. Phys.* **57** 2096

[3] Padmanabhan P 2004 *Preprint* gr-qc/0409089

[4] Leclerc M 2006 *Preprint* gr-qc/0612125

[5] Leclerc M 2007 *Preprint* gr-qc/0703048

[6] Leclerc M 2007 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **24** 4337

[7] Ferrari A F at al 2006 *Preprint* hep-th/0609222

[8] Ferrari A F at al 2007 *Phys. Lett.* B **652** 174

[9] Ghalati R N 2007 *Preprint* hep-th/0703268

[10] Dirac P A M 1958 *Proc. Roy. Soc.* A **246** 333

[11] Landau L D and Lifshitz E M 1975 *The Classical Theory of Fields*, fourth ed. (Oxford: Pergamon Press)

[12] Carmeli M 2001 *Classical Fields, General Relativity and Gauge Theory* (New Jersey: World Scientific)

[13] Dirac P A M 1964 *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics, Belfer Graduate School of Sciences* (New York: Yeshiva University)

[14] Castellani L 1982 *Ann. Phys.* **143** 357

[15] Jackiw R 1985 *Nucl. Phys.* B **252** 343

[16] Kiriushcheva N and Kuzmin S V 2006 *Mod. Phys. Lett.* A **21** 899

[17] Ghalati R N, Kiriushcheva N and Kuzmin S V 2007 *Mod. Phys. Lett.* A **22** 17

[18] Lanczos C 1970 *The Variational Princiles of Mechanics*, fourth ed., (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)

[19] Pirani F A E, Schild A and Skinner R 1952 *Phys. Rev.* **87** 452

[20] Arnowitt R, Deser S and Misner C W 1962 in: Witten L (Ed.) *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research* (New York: Wiley) p 227

[21] Arnowitt R and Deser S 1959 *Phys. Rev.* **113** 745

[22] Mukherjee P and Saha A 2007 *Preprint* 0705.4358 [hep-th]

[23] Banerjee R, Rothe H J and Rothe K D 2000 *Phys. Lett.* B **479** 429

[24] Bergmann P G and Komar A 1972 *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **5** 15

[25] Samanta S 2007 *Preprint* 0708.3300 [hep-th]

[26] Gitman D M and Tyutin I V 1990 *Quantization of Fields with Constraints* (Berlin: Springer)

[27] Kiriushcheva N, Kuzmin S V, Racknor C and Valluri S R 2008 *Phys. Lett.* A **372** 5101